

-22-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants have amended the claims and submit the following remarks. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-17, 18, 20-24, 26-34, 36, 37-43 and 44-47 were pending in this Application. Claims 18, 20-24, 26-34, 36, 42, and 44-47 are withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. By this Amendment, dependent claim 43 has been cancelled, and its subject matter has been incorporated into claim 7 from which it previously depended. Similar subject matter has been added to the non-withdrawn independent claims 1, 13, 14, 16, and 41. Non-withdrawn claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-17, and 37-41 are presented.

It is noted that claim 42 was apparently inadvertently included in elected Group I, but it appears that it should have been in non-elected Group II because it is directed to a server rather than to a browser. Thus, this claim has been withdrawn from consideration herein.

In the Office Action, the claims are rejected under various combinations of the Ali, Uppaluru and Unger references. As the independent claims have all been amended to include features of or similar to cancelled claim 43, it is assumed that the rejection of claim 43 is applicable to the independent claims as amended, and thus the rejection of claim 43 set forth on pages 24-25 of the Office Action is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended herein is directed to a method in a browser that includes selectively implementing hypertext markup language (HTML) and XML tags appearing within the web pages received by the browser based on capabilities of the user device, the capabilities being stored in a device capabilities table which includes for the user device a unique device identifier, a network address selected from (a telephone number and an IP address), and a specification of capabilities of the user device, the specification of capabilities including whether the user device accepts only text data, whether the user device

is able to respond to multiple prompts, whether the user device accepts digital audio data or only analog audio data, whether the user device has a microphone for generating analog audio signals, and whether the user device has an analog to digital converter for converting the analog audio signals to digital audio data (emphasis added). Thus, as described in the application, any user device can be served by the browser regardless of the device's capabilities, because the browser provides to the user device only the information that it can process.

The Office Action refers "col. 16, line 50 to col.5" of Uppaluru in its rejection of claim 43. This citation appears to have a typographical error and is thus confusing. The remarks below address what are believed to be the pertinent sections of Uppaluru.

Uppaluru shows a gateway 105/220 that interfaces to a subscriber 107 via a telephony interface 114 and PSTN 109. There does not appear to be any description in Uppaluru of any processing of tags that is based on capabilities of the user device (i.e. telephone) that are stored in any device capabilities table and include capabilities such as whether the user device accepts only text data, etc. Rather, it appears that Uppaluru merely assumes the normal capabilities of a telephone as a user device, and thus lacks any such capabilities table and capability information. Column 16 of Uppaluru, which is referred to in the Office Action, is seen to describe only the use of speech recognition in the system, and not any use of device capabilities information as recited in claim 1. Thus it appears that contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Uppaluru does not teach the features of claim 1 highlighted above, and thus the rejection of claim 1 is improper for at least this reason. If a rejection based on Uppaluru is to be maintained, it is respectfully requested that it be identified specifically where Uppaluru teaches the above-highlighted features of claim 1. In the absence of such any such showing, it is respectfully urged that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claim 1 is seen to be allowable.

As all the non-withdrawn claims of this application include, either directly or indirectly, features such as those of claim 1 highlighted above, the remaining

-24-

non-withdrawn claims are also seen to be allowable in view of the combination of Ali, Unger and Uppaluru. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, this Application should be in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Response, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' Representative at the number below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3661.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-2900, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,


James F. Thompson, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 36,699
Bainwood, Huang & Associates, L.L.C.
Highpoint Center
2 Connector Road
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-2900
Facsimile: (508) 366-4688

Attorney Docket No.: 1004-075

Dated: January 5, 2007